arXiv:0812.3007v1 [math.PR] 16 Dec 2008

Asymptotics for the size of the largest component scaled to "log n" in inhomogeneous random graphs.

TATYANA S. TUROVA[1]

Mathematical Center, University of Lund, Box 118, Lund S-221 00, Sweden.

Abstract

We study the inhomogeneous random graphs in the subcritical case. We derive an exact formula for the size of the largest connected component scaled to $\log n$ where n is the size of the graph. This generalizes the recent result for the "rank 1 case". Here we discover that the same well-known equation for the survival probability, whose positive solution determines the asymptotics of the size of the largest component in the supercritical case, plays the crucial role in the subcritical case as well. But now these are the *negative* solutions which come into play.

1 Introduction.

1.1 Inhomogeneous random graphs.

A general inhomogeneous random graph model which comprises numerous previously known models, was introduced and studied in great details by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [2]. Let us recall the basic definition of the inhomogeneous random graph $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)$ with a vertex space

$$\mathcal{V} = (S, \mu, (x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_n^{(n)})_{n\geq 1}).$$

Here S is a separable metric space and μ is a Borel probability measure on S. No relationship is assumed between $x_i^{(n)}$ and $x_i^{(n')}$, but to simplify notations we shall write further $(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_n^{(n)})$. For each n let $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a deterministic or random sequence of points in S, such that for any μ-continuity set $A \subseteq S$

$$\frac{\#\{i : x_i \in A\}}{n} \xrightarrow{P} \mu(A). \tag{1.1}$$

---

[1] Research was supported by the Swedish Natural Science Research Council.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 60C05; 05C80.

Key words and phrases: inhomogeneous random graphs, largest connected component, multi-type branching processes, phase transition.

Given the sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, we let $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n, \kappa)$ be the random graph on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, such that any two vertices i and j are connected by an edge independently of the others and with a probability

$$p_{x_i x_j}(n) = \min\{\kappa(x_i, x_j)/n, 1\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where the kernel κ is a symmetric non-negative measurable function on $S \times S$. We shall also assume that kernel κ is *graphical* on $\mathcal{V}$, which means that

(i) κ is continuous *a.e.* on $S \times S$;
(ii) $\kappa \in L^1(S \times S, \mu \times \mu)$;
(iii)

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{E}e\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n, \kappa)\Big) \to \frac{1}{2}\int_{S^2} \kappa(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y),$$

where $e(G)$ denotes the number of edges in a graph G.

Denote $C_1\Big(G\Big)$ the size of the largest connected component in a graph G. This is the most studied characteristic of the random graphs. In particular, the famous phenomena of phase transition is seen in the abrupt change of the value $C_1\Big(G\Big)$ depending on the parameters of the model. It appears that there is a close connection between $C_1\Big(G\Big)$ and a survival probability of a certain multi-type Galton-Watson process $B_\kappa(x)$ defined below.

Definition 1.1. *The type space of $B_\kappa(x)$ is S, and initially there is a single particle of type $x \in S$. Then at any step, a particle of type $x \in S$ is replaced in the next generation by a set of particles where the number of particles of type y has a Poisson distribution with intensity $\kappa(x, y)d\mu(y)$.*

Let $\rho_\kappa(x)$ denote the survival probability of $B_\kappa(x)$. Then Theorem 3.1 from [2] states that

$$\frac{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n, \kappa)\Big)}{n} \xrightarrow{P} \rho_\kappa := \int_S \rho_\kappa(x) d\mu(x). \tag{1.3}$$

It was also proved in [2] that $\rho_\kappa(x)$ is the maximum solution to

$$f(x) = 1 - e^{-T_\kappa[f](x)}, \tag{1.4}$$

where the integral operator T_κ is defined by

$$(T_\kappa f)(x) = \int_S \kappa(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y). \tag{1.5}$$

Whether ρ_κ is zero or strictly positive depends only on the norm

$$\|T_\kappa\| = \sup\{\|T_\kappa f\|_2 : f \geq 0, \|f\|_2 \leq 1\}.$$

Namely, due to Theorem 3.1 from [2]

$$\rho_\kappa \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} > 0, & \text{if } \ \|T_\kappa\| > 1, \\ = 0, & \text{if } \ \|T_\kappa\| \leq 1. \end{array} \right. \tag{1.6}$$

This together with (1.3) tells us that in the subcritical case, i.e., when $\|T_\kappa\| \leq 1$, we have $C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) = o_P(n)$.

Under an additional assumption

$$\sup_{x,y} \kappa(x,y) < \infty$$

Theorem 3.12 in [2] proves that if $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$ then $C_1\left(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\right) = O(\log n)$ with probability tending to one as $n \to \infty$.

On the other hand, as it was pointed out in [2], when the kernel is unbounded, the condition $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$ is not sufficient for the size of the largest component to be of order $\log n$; an example is the model of random growth from [3]. Recently Janson showed in [5] that a subcritical inhomogeneous random graph can also have the largest component of order $n^{1/\gamma}$ under the assumption of a power law degree distribution with exponent $\gamma + 1$, $\gamma > 2$.

Here we describe sufficient conditions under which $C_1\left(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\right)/\log n$ converges in probability to a finite constant even for unbounded kernels. The exact value of this constant untill recently was known only for the Erdös-Rényi random graph [4]. The first related result for the inhomogeneous model but only in the rank 1 case, i.e., when

$$\kappa(x,y) = \Phi(x)\Phi(y), \tag{1.7}$$

was derived in [9]. However, in [9] the formula for the asymptotics of $C_1\left(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\right)/\log n$ is given in terms of function Φ and thus is not applicable for a general kernel. Here we shall consider a more general situation, which includes as well case (1.7).

1.2 Results.

Denote $\mathcal{X}(x)$ the size of the total progeny of $B_\kappa(x)$, and let

$$r_\kappa = sup\,\{z \geq 1 : \int_S \mathbf{E}\left(z^{\mathcal{X}(x)}\right) d\mu(x) \ < \infty\}. \tag{1.8}$$

We will show that r_κ is the determining parameter for the size $C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)$ in the subcritical case. In particular, we need to know whether $r_\kappa = 1$ or $r_\kappa > 1$. Therefore first we shall study r_κ. One should notice the direct relation of r_κ to the tail of distribution of the total progeny $\mathcal{X}(x)$. In particular, if the tail of distribution of $\mathcal{X}(x)$ decays exponentially, r_κ defines the constant in the exponent. In the case of a single-type branching process the exact result on the relation between r_κ and the distribution of the total progeny was proved in [7].

Note that when

$$\int_S \kappa(x,y)d\mu(y) < \infty \quad \text{for all } x \in S, \tag{1.9}$$

Lemma 5.16 in [2] states the following: if $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$ then $\rho_\kappa > 0$ on a set of positive measure. This means that $\mathcal{X} = \infty$ on a set of positive measure, which immediately implies

$$r_\kappa = 1, \quad \text{if} \quad \|T_\kappa\| > 1. \tag{1.10}$$

We shall assume from now on that

$$\inf_{x,y\in S} \kappa(x,y) > 0. \tag{1.11}$$

Theorem 1.1. *r_κ is the supremum value of all $z \geq 1$ for which equation*

$$g(x) = ze^{T_\kappa[g-1](x)} \tag{1.12}$$

has a.s. (i.e., $\mu - $a.s.) finite solution $g \geq 1$.

Theorem 1.1 yields immediately the following criteria.

Corollary 1.1. *$r_\kappa > 1$ if and only if at least for some $z > 1$ equation (1.12) has an a.s. finite solution $g > 1$. Otherwise, $r_\kappa = 1$.* □

Next we extend statement (1.10) for the case $\|T_\kappa\| = 1$.

Corollary 1.2. *Let κ satisfy (1.9). Then*

$$r_\kappa = 1 \quad \textit{if} \quad \|T_\kappa\| \geq 1. \tag{1.13}$$

Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.1 will allow us to derive some sufficient conditions for $r_\kappa > 1$. Let T_κ have a finite Hilbert-Schmidt norm, i.e.,

$$\|T_\kappa\|_{HS} := \|\kappa\|_{L^2(S\times S)} = \left(\int_S\int_S \kappa^2(x,y)d\mu(x)d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2} < \infty. \tag{1.14}$$

Define

$$\psi(x) = \left(\int_S \kappa^2(x,y) d\mu(y) \right)^{1/2}, \tag{1.15}$$

and assume that for some positive constant $a > 0$

$$\int_S e^{a\psi(x)} d\mu(x) < \infty. \tag{1.16}$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let κ satisfy (1.16). Then*

$$r_\kappa > 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \|T_\kappa\| < 1 \tag{1.17}$$

and at least one of the following conditions is satisfied

$(C1)$ $\sup_{x,y\in S} \kappa(x,y) < \infty$, or

$(C2)$ $\|T_\kappa\|_{HS} < 1$, or

$(C3)$ $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $\kappa(x,y)$ is non-decreasing in both arguments, and such that for some constant $c_1 > 0$

$$\kappa(x,y) \leq c_1 T_\kappa[1](x) T_\kappa[1](y), \tag{1.18}$$

for all $x, y \in S$.

Remark 1.1. *Condition $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ in $(C3)$ one can replace by a condition that space S can be partially ordered.*

Observe that for all kernels

$$\|T_\kappa\| \leq \|T_\kappa\|_{HS},$$

where equality holds only in the rank 1 case (1.7). Hence, under assumption (1.16) in the rank 1 case condition $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$ is sufficient and necessary for $r_\kappa > 1$.

Consider now model $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)$ which satisfies (1.1) and (1.2). To be able to approximate a component in $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)$ by a branching process we need some additional conditions on the distribution of the types of vertices $x_1, \ldots, x_n$.

Assumption 1.1. *Let $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ be finite or countable, and let for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $q > 0$*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{ \frac{\#\{1 \leq i \leq n : x_i = x\}}{n} - \mu(x) \leq \varepsilon e^{qT_\kappa[1](x)} \mu(x), \ \text{for all } x \in S \right\} \to 1 \tag{1.19}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Notice, that in the case when S is finite convergence (1.19) follows simply by the assumption (1.1). Some examples of the models with countable S which satisfy condition (1.19) one can find in [10].

Theorem 1.3. *Let κ satisfy (1.16), as well as at least one of the conditions $(C1)$ or $(C3)$ from Theorem 1.2. Then under Assumption 1.1*

$$\frac{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)}{\log n} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}, \tag{1.20}$$

where

$$r_\kappa \begin{cases} > 1, & \textit{if} \ \ \|T_\kappa\| < 1, \\ \\ = 1, & \textit{if} \ \ \|T_\kappa\| \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{1.21}$$

Theorem 1.3 provides sufficient conditions when convergence (1.20) takes place even for unbounded kernels. Observe, however, that condition (1.16) seems to be necessary as well. In particular, in the "rank 1" case (1.7) condition (1.16) excludes possibility of a power law degree distribution. The later is proved ([5]) to yield order $n^{1/\gamma}$ ($\gamma > 2$) for the largest component in a subcritical graph.

Clearly, Theorem 1.3 complements statement (1.3) together with (1.6). There is even a direct relation between the values r_κ and ρ_κ as we shall see now. Setting $f(x) = -(g(x)-1)$ in (1.12), we get from Corollary 1.1 that $r_\kappa > 1$ *if and only if at least for some $z > 1$ equation*

$$f(x) = 1 - ze^{-T_\kappa[f](x)} \tag{1.22}$$

has an a.s. finite solution $f < 0$. Notice that when $z = 1$ equation (1.22) coincides with (1.4). This observation leads to a surprising direct relation to the supercritical case.

Proposition 1.1. *Let κ satisfy (1.11). Then $r_\kappa > 1$ if equation (1.4) has an a.s. finite solution f such that* $\sup_{x\in S} f(x) < 0$.

In the case of a homogeneous Erdös-Rényi graph $G_{n,p}$ (consult, e.g., [1]) where the probability of any edge is $p = c/n$, the relation between the supercritical and subcritical cases is most transparent. Placing $G_{n,p}$ into the general definition of an inhomogeneous random graph model gives us $|S| = 1$ and $\kappa \equiv c$. The corresponding branching process B_κ (see Definition 1.1) has $Po(c)$ distribution of the offspring (of a single type). The survival probability ρ_c of this process is again the maximum solution to (1.4), which takes a simple form

$$f = 1 - e^{-cf}. \tag{1.23}$$

By Corollary 1.1 we have here $r_c > 1$ if and only if equation (1.12), which in this case is

$$g = ze^{c(g-1)}, \tag{1.24}$$

has a finite solution $g > 1$ for some $z > 1$. It is straightforward to check that (1.24) has a finite positive solution for some $z > 1$ if and only if equation (1.23) has a strictly negative solution (or, else, if and only if $c < 1$).

Therefore we may conjecture that the condition in Proposition 1.1 is necessary as well.

Conjecture 1.1. *Let κ satisfy (1.11). Then $r_\kappa > 1$ if and only if equation (1.4) has an a.s. finite solution $f < 0$.*

Observe, that while all the nonnegative solutions to (1.4) are bounded by 1, the nonpositive ones can be unbounded. This certainly makes a difference for the analysis. To surpass the difficulties we introduced condition $(C3)$, which resembles a rank 1 case. One may believe that the results of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 should hold in a much more general situation than we are able to treat here.

In the special "rank 1 case" (1.7) convergence (1.20) was previously established in [9] under some additional conditions on function Φ. Note that in the rank 1 case (see for the details [9]) one can derive an explicite formula for r_κ. Clearly, condition (1.7) implies (1.18). On the other hand, there are kernels which satisfy the condition (1.18) but not (1.7). These are for example, $\kappa(x, y) = \widetilde{\kappa}(x \vee y)$, where $\widetilde{\kappa}$ is a positive monotone increasing function on S, such that $\int_S \widetilde{\kappa}^2 d\mu < \infty$. Models with kernels of this type were considered, e.g., in [2] and [8].

2 The generating function for the progeny of a branching process.

Recall that we denote $\mathcal{X}(x)$ the size of the total progeny of $B_\kappa(x)$, (see Definition 1.1 in the Introduction). We shall study function

$$h_z(x) = \mathbf{E} z^{\mathcal{X}(x)}, \quad x \in S,$$

for $z \geq 1$. It is standard to derive (consult, e.g., [6], Chapter 6) that $h_z(k)$ as a generating function for a branching process satisfies the following equation

$$h_z(k) = z \exp\left\{ \int_S \kappa(k, x)(h_z(x) - 1) d\mu(x) \right\}, \qquad k \in S,$$

or in a functional form:

$$h_z = ze^{T_\kappa[h_z-1]} =: \Phi_{z,\kappa} h_z. \tag{2.1}$$

Theorem 2.1. *For any $z \geq 1$ function h_z is the minimal solution $f \geq 1$ to the equation*

$$f = \Phi_{z,\kappa} f, \tag{2.2}$$

and moreover

$$h_z = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1]. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Let us denote $\mathcal{X}_k(x)$, $k \geq 0$, the number of the offspring of the process $B_\kappa(x)$ in the first k generations. In particular, $\mathcal{X}_0(x) = 1$ and

$$\mathcal{X}_1(x) =_d 1 + P_x,$$

where P_x is the number of the offspring of a particle of type x, among which the number of particles of each type $y \in S$ has $Po(\kappa(x,y)d\mu(y))$-distribution. Let

$$h_{k,z}(x) = \mathbf{E} z^{\mathcal{X}_k(x)}$$

for $k \geq 0$. It is straightforward to derive that

$$h_{1,z}(x) = \mathbf{E} z^{\mathcal{X}_1(x)} = \Phi_{z,\kappa}[z](x) = \Phi_{z,\kappa}[h_{0,z}](x),$$

and similarly for any $k \geq 1$

$$h_{k+1,z}(x) = \Phi_{z,\kappa}[h_{k,z}](x).$$

Noticing that $h_{0,z}(x) = z = \Phi_{z,\kappa}[1](x)$ for all $x \in S$, we derive from here

$$h_{k,z}(x) = \Phi^{k+1}_{z,\kappa}[1](x). \tag{2.4}$$

Obviously, $h_{k,z}(x) \nearrow h_z(x)$, i.e.,

$$h_z(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1](x)$$

for all $x \in S$. By the monotone convergence

$$T_\kappa[h_z](x) = \int_S \kappa(x,y) \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1](y) d\mu(y) = \lim_{k\to\infty} T_\kappa[\Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1]](x),$$

and therefore

$$\Phi_{z,\kappa}[h_z](x) = e^{\lim_{k\to\infty} T_\kappa[\Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1]-1](x)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi_{z,\kappa}[\Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1]](x) = h_z(x). \tag{2.5}$$

Hence, $h_z = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1]$ is a solution to (2.2).

Since $\Phi_{z,\kappa}$ is monotone and $\Phi_{z,\kappa}[1](x) = z \geq 1$, it follows by induction that

$$h_z(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1](x) \geq 1 \tag{2.6}$$

for all $x \in S$.

Finally, we show that h_z is the minimal solution $f \geq 1$ to (2.2). Assume, that there is a solution $f \geq 1$ such that $1 \leq f(x) < h_z(x)$ for some x. Then due to the monotonicity of $\Phi_{z,\kappa}$ we have also

$$\Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[1](x) \leq \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[f](x) = f(x) < h_z(x) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \Phi^N_{z,\kappa}[1](x)$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Letting $k \to \infty$ in the last formula we come to the contradiction with the strict inequality in the middle. Therefore h_z is the minimal solution $f \geq 1$ to (2.2). $\square$

Remark 2.1. *If $f \geq 1$ satisfies (2.2) and $f(x) < \infty$ at least for some x, then it follows straight from the definition of $\Phi_{z,\kappa}$ that $\int_S \kappa(x,y)f(y)d\mu(y) < \infty$. Hence, under assumption (1.11) if $f \geq 1$ satisfies (2.2) then either $f = \infty$ a.s., or $f < \infty$ a.s., in which case also $\int_S \kappa(x,y)f(y)d\mu(y) < \infty$ a.s. The latter together with the assumption (1.11) yields $f \in L_1(S,\mu)$ as well.*

Remark 2.2. *Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.1 follow directly from Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.1.*

Next we describe a sufficient condition when the minimal solution $f \geq 1$ to the equation (2.2) is finite.

Lemma 2.1. *If $\Phi_{z,\kappa}f \leq f$ for some $f \geq 1$, then there exists function $1 \leq g \leq f$ which is a solution to (2.2), i.e., $\Phi_{z,\kappa}g = g$.*

Proof. (The proof almost repeats the one of Lemma 5.12 from [2].) The monotonicity of $\Phi_{z,\kappa}$ and assumption $\Phi_{z,\kappa}f \leq f$ yield by induction

$$f \geq \Phi_{z,\kappa}f \geq \Phi^2_{z,\kappa}f \geq \dots .$$

Since $f \geq 1$ we have for all x

$$\Phi_{z,\kappa}[f](x) = ze^{T_\kappa[f-1](x)} \geq z \geq 1,$$

which implies by induction that also $\Phi^k_{z,\kappa}f \geq 1$ for all $k \geq 1$. Hence the limit

$$f(x) \geq g(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{z,\kappa}[f](x) \geq 1$$

exists for every x. By the monotone convergence (repeat the argument from (2.5)) g is a solution to (2.2). $\square$

Theorem 2.2. *Let κ satisfy condition (1.16).*
(i) If $\|T_\kappa\|_{HS} < 1$ then at least for some $z > 1$ there is a finite function $f \geq 1$ which satisfies equation (2.2).
(ii) If $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$ and kernel κ satisfies condition $(C1)$ or condition $(C3)$ from Theorem 1.2, then at least for some $z > 1$ there is a finite function $f \geq 1$ which satisfies equation (2.2).

Proof. To prove (i) we shall construct a function $f \geq 1$ which satisfies conditions of Lemma 2.1. Let $\|T_\kappa\|_{HS} = \lambda < 1$. Then

$$\|\psi\|_2 = \lambda \tag{2.7}$$

(see definition of ψ in (1.15)). For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ let us define

$$g(x, \varepsilon) = T_\kappa \left[e^{\varepsilon\psi} - 1\right](x) = \int_S \kappa(x, y) \left(e^{\varepsilon\psi(y)} - 1\right) d\mu(y). \tag{2.8}$$

By the Cauchy-Bunyakovskii inequality

$$g(x, \varepsilon) \leq \left(\int_S \kappa^2(x, y) d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_S \left(e^{\varepsilon\psi(y)} - 1\right)^2 d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2} = \psi(x)A(\varepsilon), \tag{2.9}$$

where function

$$A(\varepsilon) := \left(\int_S \left(e^{\varepsilon\psi(y)} - 1\right)^2 d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2}$$

is increasing and by the assumption (1.16) and the dominated convergence is continuous on $[0, a/4]$. Furthermore, for $0 < \varepsilon < a/4$ we can compute

$$A'(\varepsilon) = \frac{\int_S \psi(y) e^{\varepsilon\psi(y)} \left(e^{\varepsilon\psi(y)} - 1\right) d\mu(y)}{\left(\int_S \left(e^{\varepsilon\psi(y)} - 1\right)^2 d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2}}.$$

Using again the Cauchy-Bunyakovskii inequality and condition (1.16) we derive from here that for any small positive ε

$$A'(\varepsilon) \leq \left(\int_S \psi^2(y) e^{2\varepsilon\psi(y)} d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\int_S M e^{3\varepsilon\psi(y)} d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2} < \infty,$$

where M is some absolute positive constant. Hence, taking into account (2.7) we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} A'(\varepsilon) \leq \|\psi\|_2 = \lambda < \lambda + \frac{1 - \lambda}{2} =: \lambda_1 < 1.$$

This bound together with $A(0) = 0$ and the mean-value Theorem allows us to conclude that there exists some positive value $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$

$$A(\varepsilon) < \lambda_1 \varepsilon. \tag{2.10}$$

Therefore for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ we get by (2.9)

$$g(x, \varepsilon) \leq \psi(x) A(\varepsilon) < \lambda_1 \varepsilon \psi(x). \tag{2.11}$$

Now fix $z > 1$ arbitrarily and denote $\widetilde{\psi} = z\psi$. Define also a function

$$\widetilde{g}(x, \varepsilon) = zT_\kappa \left[e^{\varepsilon \widetilde{\psi}} - 1 \right](x) = zT_\kappa \left[e^{\varepsilon z \psi} - 1 \right](x) = zg(x, z\varepsilon). \tag{2.12}$$

According to (2.11) we have

$$\widetilde{g}(x, \varepsilon) \leq z\varepsilon\lambda_1 \widetilde{\psi}(x) \tag{2.13}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Let us set

$$f_z = z \left(e^{\varepsilon \widetilde{\psi}} - 1 \right) + 1.$$

We claim, that for some $z > 1$

$$\Phi_z[f_z] \leq f_z. \tag{2.14}$$

Indeed, consider

$$\Phi_z[f_z] := \Phi_{z,\kappa}[f_z] = ze^{T_\kappa[f_z - 1]} = ze^{zT_\kappa[e^{\varepsilon \widetilde{\psi}} - 1]}. \tag{2.15}$$

Using definition (2.12) and bound (2.13) we obtain from here

$$\Phi_z[f_z](x) = ze^{\widetilde{g}(x,\varepsilon)} \leq ze^{z\varepsilon\lambda_1 \widetilde{\psi}(x)}. \tag{2.16}$$

Let us assume now that $1 < z < \delta/\lambda_1$ for some $\lambda_1 < \delta < 1$. Then we have

$$e^{z\varepsilon\lambda_1 \widetilde{\psi}(x)} \leq e^{\varepsilon\delta\widetilde{\psi}(x)}. \tag{2.17}$$

Under assumption (1.11) we have $\psi(x) > b > 0$ for some positive b, which implies that $\widetilde{\psi}(x) > b$ as well. Therefore we can find $1 < z < \delta/\lambda_1$ such that for all $x \in S$

$$e^{\varepsilon\delta\widetilde{\psi}(x)} \leq e^{\varepsilon\widetilde{\psi}(x)} - \frac{z-1}{z},$$

which together with (2.17) gives us

$$ze^{z\varepsilon\lambda_1\widetilde{\psi}(x)} \leq ze^{\varepsilon\delta\widetilde{\psi}(x)} \leq z\left(e^{\varepsilon\widetilde{\psi}(x)} - \frac{z-1}{z} \right) = z\left(e^{\varepsilon\widetilde{\psi}(x)} - 1 \right) + 1 = f_z(x).$$

Substituting this bound into (2.16) we finally get (2.14). Hence, function f_z satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1, by which the statement (i) of Theorem 2.2 follows.

The proof of statement (ii) is very similar to the previous one. Let $\|T_\kappa\| = \lambda < 1$. Assume first that condition $(C3)$ is satisfied. Recall that by Lemma 5.15 [2] operator T_κ with a finite Hilbert-Schmidt norm (assumption (1.14)) has a nonnegative eigenfunction $\phi \in L^2(S, \mu)$ such that $T_\kappa \phi = \|T_\kappa\| \phi$. Hence, there is a function ϕ such that $\|\phi\|_2 = 1$ and

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_S \kappa(x, y) \phi(y) d\mu(y). \tag{2.18}$$

This together with the Cauchy-Bunyakovskii inequality immediately implies

$$\phi(x) \le \frac{1}{\lambda} \psi(x). \tag{2.19}$$

Under the assumptions of monotonicity of κ equality (2.18) implies that $\phi(x)$ is also monotone increasing, therefore

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_S \kappa(x, y) \phi(y) d\mu(y) \ge \frac{1}{\lambda} T_\kappa[1](x) \int_S \phi(y) d\mu(y) = \frac{c_2}{\lambda} T_\kappa[1](x) \tag{2.20}$$

for some $c_2 > 0$. Next, taking into account condition (1.18) we derive

$$\psi^2(x) = \int_S \kappa^2(x, y) d\mu(y) \le c_1^2 (T_\kappa[1](x))^2 \int_S (T_\kappa[1](y))^2 d\mu(y) \le c_1^2 (T_\kappa[1](x))^2 \|T_\kappa\|_{HS}^2. \tag{2.21}$$

Combining now (2.21), (2.20) and (2.19) we get

$$\frac{c_2}{\lambda} T_\kappa[1](x) \le \phi(x) \le \frac{1}{\lambda} \psi(x) \le \frac{1}{\lambda} c_1 T_\kappa[1](x) \|T_\kappa\|_{HS},$$

which immediately yields

$$\frac{\psi(x)}{\phi(x)} \le \frac{c_1 \lambda \|T_\kappa\|_{HS}}{c_2} \tag{2.22}$$

for all $x \in S$. Notice that (1.11) implies

$$\phi(x) \ge c_0 > 0 \tag{2.23}$$

for all $x \in S$ and some $c_0 > 0$.

We can show now that function

$$F_z(x) = z \left(e^{\varepsilon \phi(x)} - 1 \right) - 1 \tag{2.24}$$

satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1 for some positive ε. First we consider similar to (2.8) function

$$G(x,\varepsilon) = T_\kappa \left[e^{\varepsilon\phi} - 1\right](x) = \int_S \kappa(x,y)\left(e^{\varepsilon\phi(y)} - 1\right) d\mu(y).$$

From here we derive using assumption (1.16) and bound (2.19), that at least for all $\varepsilon < a\lambda/4$ functions

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon} G(x,\varepsilon) = \int_S \kappa(x,y)\phi(y)e^{\varepsilon\phi(y)} d\mu(y) \tag{2.25}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varepsilon^2} G(x,\varepsilon) = \int_S \kappa(x,y)\phi(y)^2 e^{\varepsilon\phi(y)} d\mu(y) \tag{2.26}$$

are finite and non-negative for any $x \in S$. Note that for all $x \in S$

$$G(x,0) = 0,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon} G(x,\varepsilon) \mid_{\varepsilon=0} = \int_S \kappa(x,y)\phi(y) d\mu(y) = \lambda\phi(x). \tag{2.27}$$

Therefore for all $x \in S$ and $0 \le \varepsilon < a\lambda/4$ we have

$$G(x,\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon\left(\lambda\phi(x) + \varepsilon\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varepsilon^2} G(x,\varepsilon)\right). \tag{2.28}$$

Under the assumption (1.16) we get from (2.26) and (2.19), that for all $0 \le \varepsilon < a\lambda/4$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varepsilon^2} G(x,\varepsilon) \le \psi(x) \int_S \phi(y)^4 e^{2\varepsilon\phi(y)} d\mu(y) \le \psi(x) c_3, \tag{2.29}$$

where c_3 is some positive constant. Taking also into account bound (2.22), we derive from (2.29)

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varepsilon^2} G(x,\varepsilon) \le c_4\phi(x)$$

for some positive constant c_4. Substituting this into (2.28), we get

$$G(x,\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon\phi(x)\left(\lambda + \varepsilon c_4\right). \tag{2.30}$$

It is clear that for all small $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\lambda + \varepsilon c_4 < \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda}{2} := \lambda_1 < 1.$$

This together with (2.30) immediately yields

$$G(x,\varepsilon) \le \lambda_1 \varepsilon \phi(x) \tag{2.31}$$

for all small $\varepsilon > 0$. Then repeating almost exactly the same argument which led from (2.11) to (2.14), one can derive from (2.31) that for F_z defined by (2.24)

$$\Phi_z[F_z] \le F_z.$$

Hence, function F_z satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1, which yields statement (ii) when κ satisfies $(C3)$.

Finally, let $\|T_\kappa\| = \lambda < 1$, and let condition $(C1)$ be satisfied. Taking into account assumptions (1.11) we easily derive bounds similar to (1.18) and (2.22). Then the rest of the proof simply repeats the previous one. This completes the proof of statement (ii) and finishes the proof of Theorem 2.2. □

3 Proofs of the main results.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1.

The statement follows immediately by Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.1. □

3.2 Proof of Corollary 1.2.

Lemma 3.1. *If* $\|T_\kappa\| = 1$ *one has*

$$\lim_{c \uparrow 1} r_{c\kappa} = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}^c$ denote the total progeny of the $B_{c\kappa}$ (see Definition 1.1). It is clear that if $0 < c < c'$ then $\mathcal{X}^{c'}$ stochastically dominates $\mathcal{X}^c$, and therefore it is obvious that $r_{c\kappa}$ is a monotone non-increasing function in $c > 0$. Also, it follows from the definition of $r_{c\kappa}$, that $r_{c\kappa} \ge 1$. Hence, there exists $\lim_{c\uparrow 1} r_{c\kappa} \ge 1$. Assume,

$$\lim_{c \uparrow 1} r_{c\kappa} =: r > 1. \tag{3.2}$$

Define

$$1 < z := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{r}{2} < \lim_{c \uparrow 1} r_{c\kappa}.$$

Then by Theorem 1.1 for any fixed $c < 1$ there exists minimal solution $1 \leq f < \infty$ to (2.2):

$$f = ze^{T_{c\kappa}[f-1]}.$$

Notice that also

$$f(x) \geq z$$

for all $x \in S$. Let $c' = \sqrt{z} > 1$ and set

$$g := \frac{f}{c'} \geq \sqrt{z} > 1. \tag{3.3}$$

It is straightforward to derive

$$\Phi_{\sqrt{z},c'c\kappa}[g] = \sqrt{z}e^{c'T_{c\kappa}[g-1]} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}ze^{T_{c\kappa}[c'g-1]-(c'-1)T_{c\kappa}[1]} = \frac{1}{c'}fe^{-(c'-1)T_{c\kappa}[1]} \leq g.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.1 there exists a function $1 < h < \infty$ such that

$$h = \Phi_{\sqrt{z},c'c\kappa}[h] \equiv \sqrt{z}e^{T_{\sqrt{z}c\kappa}[h-1]}. \tag{3.4}$$

Choose now $\frac{1}{\sqrt{z}} < c < 1$. Then existence of an *a.s.* finite solution $h > 1$ to equation (3.4) with $\sqrt{z} > 1$ implies by Theorem 1.1 that $r_{\sqrt{z}c\kappa} > 1$ even when $\|T_{\sqrt{z}c\kappa}\| = \sqrt{z}c > 1$. We get a contradiction with (1.10), which finishes the proof of Lemma. $\square$

By Lemma 3.1 we have

$$1 = \lim_{c \uparrow 1} r_{c\kappa} \geq r_\kappa \geq 1,$$

which yields

$$r_\kappa = 1, \quad \text{if} \quad \|T_\kappa\| = 1. \tag{3.5}$$

This together with (1.10) completes the proof of Corollary 1.2. $\square$

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2.

The statement follows immediately by Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 2.2. $\square$

3.4 Proof of Proposition 1.1.

Assume, equation (1.4) has an *a.s.* finite solution f such that $\sup_{x\in S} f(x) < 0$. We shall show that in this case there is $z > 1$ such that equation (1.12) has *a.s.* finite solution $g \geq 1$. This by Theorem 1.1 will imply $r_\kappa > 1$.

By our assumption

$$f = 1 - e^{-T_\kappa[f]}.$$

Then for $h := -(f-1) > 1$ we have

$$h = e^{T_\kappa[h-1]}. \tag{3.6}$$

Claim. There are $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $z > 1$ such that function

$$H = \varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)h \tag{3.7}$$

satisfies inequality

$$\Phi_z[H] := ze^{T_\kappa[H-1]} \leq H. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof of the Claim. By (3.6) we have for any $z > 1$

$$\Phi_z[H] = ze^{T_\kappa[\varepsilon+(1-\varepsilon)h-1]} = z\left(e^{T_\kappa[h-1]}\right)^{1-\varepsilon} = zh^{1-\varepsilon} \equiv z\, \frac{h^{1-\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)h}\, H. \tag{3.9}$$

Define for all $q \geq 1$

$$Q(\varepsilon, q) := \frac{q^{1-\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)q}.$$

It is straightforward to compute that for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and for any $q > 1$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q} Q(\varepsilon, q) = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)q^{-\varepsilon}(\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)q) - q^{1-\varepsilon}(1-\varepsilon)}{(\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)q)^2} < 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Recall that by the assumption

$$h_* = \inf_{x\in S} h(x) = 1 - \sup_{x\in S} f(x) > 1.$$

Hence, by (3.10) for all $x \in S$

$$Q(\varepsilon, h(x)) \leq Q(\varepsilon, h_*) < Q(\varepsilon, 1) = 1.$$

Setting now $z = \frac{1}{Q(\varepsilon, h_*)} > 1$ we derive from (3.9)

$$\Phi_z[H] \leq H,$$

which proves our Claim. □

Notice, that by the definition

$$H = \varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)h = 1 + (1-\varepsilon)(h-1) \geq 1,$$

since $h > 1$. This and (3.8) confirm that the conditions on Lemma 2.1 are fulfilled by function H. Therefore by Lemma 2.1 there exists *a.s.* finite solution $g \geq 1$ to (1.12) with some $z > 1$. This completes the proof of Proposition 1.1. □

3.5 Proof of Theorem 1.3.

3.5.1 The upper bound.

Theorem 3.1. *If* $\|T\| < 1$ *then under conditions of Theorem 1.3 one has* $r_\kappa > 1$ *and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) > \left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} + \delta\right)\log n\right\} = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

for any $\delta > 0$.

Proof. Notice that here $r_\kappa > 1$ simply by Theorem 1.2.

Throughout the proof we assume that the condition $(C3)$ is satisfied. In the case of $(C1)$ the proof repeats the same arguments with obvious simplifications.

Recall the usual algorithm of finding a connected component in a random graph. Given the sequence $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and a corresponding graph $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)$, take any vertex $1 \le i \le n$ to be the root. Find all vertices connected to this vertex i in the graph $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)$, and then mark i as "saturated". Then for each non-saturated revealed vertex, we find all vertices connected to it but which have not been used previously. We continue this process until we end up with a tree of saturated vertices.

Denote τ_n^i the set of vertices in the tree constructed according to the above algorithm with the root at vertex i. Then for any $\omega > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) > \omega\right\} = \mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{1\le i\le n} |\tau_n^i| > \omega\right\}. \tag{3.12}$$

Let constant a be the one from condition (1.16). Then for any

$$0 \le q < a/2 \tag{3.13}$$

define an auxiliary probability measure on S:

$$\mu_q(x) = m_q e^{qT_\kappa[1](x)}\mu(x) \tag{3.14}$$

with a normalizing constant

$$m_q := \left(\sum_S e^{qT_\kappa[1](x)}\mu(x)\right)^{-1},$$

which is strictly positive due to assumption (1.16). Notice that $\mu_0(x) = \mu(x)$ for all $x \in S$, and m_q is continuous in q on $[0, a/2]$ with $m_0 = 1$. This implies in particular, that for any $\varepsilon' > 0$ one can choose positive q so that

$$\mu(x) \le (1+\varepsilon')\mu_q(x) \tag{3.15}$$

for all x. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < q < a/2$ arbitrarily and define an event

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \left\{ \frac{\#\{1 \le i \le n : x_i = x\}}{n} - \mu(x) \le \varepsilon \mu_q(x), \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in S \right\}. \tag{3.16}$$

By assumption (1.19) we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\mathcal{B}_n\right\} = 1 - o(1). \tag{3.17}$$

Then we derive from (3.12) that

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{ C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) > \omega \right\} \le \mathbf{P}\left\{ \max_{1 \le i \le n} |\tau_n^i| > \omega \mid \mathcal{B}_n \right\} + o(1). \tag{3.18}$$

Notice that the distribution of the size $|\tau_n^i|$ depends only on the type x_i of vertex i. Then using notation

$$|\tau_n(x)| =_d |\tau_n^i|\Big|_{x_i = x} \tag{3.19}$$

for each $x \in S$, we derive from (3.18)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{ C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) > \omega \right\} \le n \sum_{x \in S} (\mu(x) + \varepsilon \mu_q(x))\, \mathbf{P}\left\{ |\tau_n(x)| > \omega \mid \mathcal{B}_n \right\} + o(1) \tag{3.20}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

To approximate the distribution of $|\tau_n(x)|$ we shall use the following branching processes. For any $c \ge 1$ and $q \ge 0$ let $B_{c,q}$ denote a process defined similar to B_κ in Definition 1.1, but with the distribution of the offspring

$$Po\left(c\kappa(x,y)\mu_q(y)\right)$$

instead of $Po\left(\kappa(x,y)\mu(y)\right)$. Notice, that $B_{1,0}$ is defined exactly as B_κ. Let further $\mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x)$ denote the total number of the particles (including the initial one) produced by the branching process $B_{c,q}$ starting with a single particle of type x.

Proposition 3.1. *Under conditions of Theorem 1.3 one can find $q > 0$ and $c > 1$ arbitrarily close to 0 and 1, correspondingly, such that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ in the definition of $\mathcal{B}_n$*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{ |\tau_n(x)| > \omega \mid \mathcal{B}_n \right\} \le \mathbf{P}\left\{ \mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x) > \omega \right\} \tag{3.21}$$

for all $x \in S$, $\omega > 0$, and for all large n.

Proof. Observe that at each step of the exploration algorithm which defines τ_n^i, the number of the type y offspring of a particle of type x has a binomial distribution $Bin(N'_y, p_{xy}(n))$ where N'_y is the number of the remaining vertices of type y.

We shall use a well-known fact that a binomial $Bin(n,p)$ distribution is dominated by a Poisson distribution $Po(-n\log(1-p))$. First we shall derive an upper bound for N'_y. Notice that conditionally on $\mathcal{B}_n$ we have

$$N'_y \le \#\{1 \le i \le n : x_i = y\} \le n(\mu(y) + \varepsilon\mu_q(y)) \tag{3.22}$$

for each $y \in S$. The last inequality implies that for any y such that

$$\#\{1 \le i \le n : x_i = y\} > 0$$

we have

$$n(\mu(y) + \varepsilon\mu_q(y)) \ge 1. \tag{3.23}$$

By the Cauchy-Bunyakovskii inequality and by assumption (1.16) we have

$$\sum_S e^{qT_\kappa[1](x)}\mu(x) \le \sum_S e^{q\psi(x)}\mu(x) < \infty$$

for all $q \le a$. Hence, for all $0 < q < a/2$ and for all $y \in S$

$$\mu(y) + \varepsilon\mu_q(y) \le b_3\left(e^{-aT_\kappa[1](y)} + \varepsilon m_q e^{(q-a)T_\kappa[1](y)}\right) \le b_2 e^{-aT_\kappa[1](y)/2},$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, where b_2, b_3 are some positive constants. Combining this with (3.23) we obtain for all y such that $\#\{1 \le i \le n : x_i = y\} > 0$

$$\frac{1}{n} \le \mu(y) + \varepsilon\mu_q(y) \le b_2 e^{-aT_\kappa[1](y)/2}.$$

This implies that conditionally on $\mathcal{B}_n$

$$\max_{x \in \{x_1,\dots,x_n\}} T_\kappa[1](x) \le A_1 \log n$$

for some constant A_1. Taking into account assumption (1.18), we derive from here that for all large n conditionally on $\mathcal{B}_n$

$$p_{x_ix_j}(n) = \frac{\kappa(x_i,x_j)}{n} \le \frac{c_1(A_1\log n)^2}{n}. \tag{3.24}$$

The last bound and (3.22) together with (3.15) allow us for any fixed positive ε_1 to choose ε and q so that conditionally on $\mathcal{B}_n$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} -N_y' \log\left(1-p_{xy}(n)\right) &\le \left(\mu(y)+\varepsilon\mu_q(y)\right) n \left|\log\left(1-p_{xy}(n)\right)\right| \\ &\le (1+\varepsilon_1)\mu_q(y)\kappa(x,y) =: c\mu_q(y)\kappa(x,y) \qquad (3.25) \end{aligned}$$

for all large n and all $x, y \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Hence, (3.25) holds for any $q > 0$ and $c > 1$ arbitrarily close to 0 and 1, respectively. It follows by (3.25) that the binomial distribution $Bin(N_y', p_{xy}(n))$ is dominated stochastically by the Poisson distribution $Po(c\mu_q(y)\kappa(x,y))$. Therefore if conditionally on $\mathcal{B}_n$ at each step of the exploration algorithm which reveals τ_n^i, we replace the $Bin(N_y', p_{xy}(n))$ variable with the $Po\left(c\mu_q(y)\kappa(x,y)\right)$ one, we arrive at the statement (3.21) of the Proposition. □

Substituting (3.21) into (3.20) we derive that for any $q > 0$ and $c > 1$, one has

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) > \omega\right\} \le bn \sum_{x\in S} \mu_q(x) \mathbf{P}\left\{\mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x) > \omega\right\} + o(1)$$

as $n \to \infty$, where b is some positive constant. This bound together with the Markov inequality imply for all $z \ge 1$

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) > \omega\right\} \le bnz^{-\omega} \sum_{x\in S} \mu_q(x) \mathbf{E} z^{\mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x)} + o(1). \qquad (3.26)$$

Let $T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}$ denote an integral operator associated with branching process $B_{c,q}$

$$T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}[f](x) = \int_S c\kappa(x,y) f(y) d\mu_q(y) = \sum_S c\kappa(x,y) f(y)\mu_q(y). \qquad (3.27)$$

Assume from now on that $q > 0$ and $c > 1$ are such that

$$cm_q \ge 1. \qquad (3.28)$$

We shall extend now the result from Lemma 7.2 in [2] on the approximation of kernels for our special case of unbounded kernels. First, taking into account conditions (1.16) and (1.18) we derive that for any fixed $q < a/4$ and $c > 1$

$$\|T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}\|_{HS}^2 = \int_S \int_S (cm_q)^2 \kappa^2(x,y) e^{qT_\kappa[1](x)} e^{qT_\kappa[1](y)} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) < \infty.$$

Then by the Theorem on Dominated Convergence

$$\|T_{c\kappa,\mu_q} - T_\kappa\|_{HS}^2 \to 0 \tag{3.29}$$

as $c \to 1$ and $q \to 0$. Furthermore, since

$$\|T_\kappa\| \leq \|T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}\| \leq \|T_\kappa\| + \|T_{c\kappa,\mu_q} - T_\kappa\|_{HS},$$

convergence (3.29) implies as well

$$\|T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}\| \to \|T_\kappa\|$$

as $c \to 1$ and $q \to 0$. Hence, if $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$ then we can choose $0 < q < a/4$ and $c > 1$ so that (3.28) holds together with

$$\|T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}\| < 1. \tag{3.30}$$

Now for all values c and q for which (3.30) holds we have by Theorem 2.2, part (*ii*) that

$$r(q,c) := \sup\{z \geq 1 : \sum_{x \in S} \mathbf{E} z^{\mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x)} \ \mu_q(x) < \infty\} > 1, \tag{3.31}$$

and therefore for all $1 < z < r(q,c)$

$$\sum_{x \in S} \mu_q(x) \mathbf{E} z^{\mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x)} < \infty. \tag{3.32}$$

Notice, that condition (3.28) implies that $\mathcal{X}^{c,q}(x)$ is stochastically larger than $\mathcal{X}(x)$ for any $x \in S$, which clearly yields

$$r(q,c) \leq r_\kappa. \tag{3.33}$$

Lemma 3.2. *For any $z < r_\kappa$ there are $q > 0$ and $c \geq 1/m_q$ such that*

$$z \leq r(q,c) \leq r_\kappa. \tag{3.34}$$

Proof. Notice that when $z \leq 1$ statement (3.34) follows by (3.31) and (3.33).

Let us fix $1 < z < r_\kappa$ arbitrarily. We shall show that for some $q > 0$ and $c \geq 1/m_q$ equation

$$f = z e^{T_{c\kappa,\mu_q}[f-1]} \tag{3.35}$$

has a finite solution $f \geq 1$. This by Theorem 1.1 will imply that $z \leq r(q,c)$. The later together with (3.33) would immediately yield (3.34).

First we rewrite equation (3.35). Let $q > 0$ and $c \geq 1/m_q$ be such that (3.30) holds. Set

$$c_q := cm_q \geq 1,$$

and denote

$$\widetilde{\kappa}(x,y) = c_q \kappa(x,y) e^{qT_\kappa[1](y)}.$$

Then (3.35) becomes

$$f = \Phi_{z,\widetilde{\kappa}}[f]. \tag{3.36}$$

Since

$$\Phi_{z,\widetilde{\kappa}}[f] = z \exp\{T_\kappa[c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]} f] - T_{\widetilde{\kappa}}[1]\},$$

setting $g = c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]} f$ we can rewrite equation (3.36) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} g &= c_q z \exp\{T_\kappa[g-1] + T_\kappa[1] + qT_\kappa[1] - T_{\widetilde{\kappa}}[1]\} \\ &= \Phi_{c_q z,\kappa}[g] e^{(1+q)T_\kappa[1] - T_{\widetilde{\kappa}}[1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, equation (3.36) has a finite solution $f \geq 1$ if and only if equation

$$g = \Phi_{c_q z,\kappa}[g] e^{(1+q)T_\kappa[1] - T_{\widetilde{\kappa}}[1]} =: G[g] \tag{3.37}$$

has a finite solution $g \geq c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]}$. Observe that G is a monotone operator, i.e., if $g \geq g_1$ then $G[g] \geq G[g_1]$. Since

$$G[g] = c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]} \Phi_{z,\widetilde{\kappa}}[c_q^{-1} e^{-qT_\kappa[1]} g],$$

for any

$$g \geq c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]}$$

we have

$$G[g] \geq c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]}.$$

If we find a function g_0 such that

$$g_0 \geq c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]} \tag{3.38}$$

and

$$G[g_0] \leq g_0, \tag{3.39}$$

we can derive (using the argument similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1) that

$$g := \lim_{n\to\infty} G^n[g_0] \geq c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]} \tag{3.40}$$

is the finite solution to (3.37).

Let g_0 be the minimal positive solution to

$$g_0 = \Phi_{c_q z,\kappa}[g_0], \tag{3.41}$$

where we assume that

$$c_q z < r_\kappa. \tag{3.42}$$

By Theorem 1.1 the minimal positive solution to (3.41) is finite. Furthermore, according to formula (2.6) we have

$$g_0 \geq \Phi^2_{c_q z,\kappa}[1] = c_q z e^{(c_q z - 1)T_\kappa[1]} \geq c_q e^{(c_q - 1)T_\kappa[1]}, \tag{3.43}$$

where we used the fact that $z > 1$. Now for a fixed previously $1 < z < r_\kappa$ we can choose

$$0 < q \leq \frac{r_\kappa}{z} - 1, \tag{3.44}$$

and then set

$$c_q = 1 + q. \tag{3.45}$$

With this choice of constants we have condition (3.42) satisfied, and moreover from (3.43) we derive

$$g_0 \geq c_q e^{(c_q - 1)T_\kappa[1]} = c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1]}, \tag{3.46}$$

which means that condition (3.38) is satisfied as well. Notice also that by (3.44) and (3.45)

$$(1+q)T_\kappa[1](x) - T_{\widetilde{\kappa}}[1](x) = \int_S \left(1 + q - c_q e^{qT_\kappa[1](x)}\right) \kappa(x,y) d\mu(y) \tag{3.47}$$

$$\leq \int_S (1 + q - c_q)\, \kappa(x,y) d\mu(y) = 0.$$

Therefore with constants (3.44) and (3.45) we derive from (3.37), (3.47) and (3.41) that

$$G[g_0] = \Phi_{c_q z,\kappa}[g_0] e^{(1+q)T_\kappa[1] - T_{\widetilde{\kappa}}[1]} \leq \Phi_{c_q z,\kappa}[g_0] = g_0.$$

Hence, conditions (3.38) and (3.39) are fulfilled. Then by (3.40) equation (3.37) has a desired finite solution. In turn, this implies that equation (3.36) has a finite solution $f \geq 1$, which yields statement (3.34). □

By Lemma 3.2 for any $\delta > 0$ we can choose a small $\delta' > 0$ and (q, c) close to $(0, 1)$ so that (3.32) holds with

$$z = r(q,c) - \delta' > 1,$$

and moreover

$$\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}+\delta\right)\log(r(q,c)-\delta')>1. \tag{3.48}$$

Now setting $\omega=\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}+\delta\right)\log n$ and $z=r(q,c)-\delta'$ in (3.26) we derive with a help of (3.32)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)>\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}+\delta\right)\log n\right\}\le b_1 n z^{-\omega}+o(1)$$
$$=b_1 n\exp\left\{-\log(r(q,c)-\delta')\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}+\delta\right)\log n\right\}+o(1)$$

where b_1 is some finite positive constant. This together with (3.48) yields statement (3.11).

□

3.5.2 The lower bound.

Theorem 3.2. *If $\|T\|<1$ then under conditions of Theorem 1.3 one has $r_\kappa>1$ and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)<\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}-\delta\right)\log n\right\}=0 \tag{3.49}$$

for any $\delta>0$.

Proof. Fix any small positive δ and denote

$$\omega=\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa}-\delta\right)\log n, \tag{3.50}$$

$$N=N(n)=\frac{n}{\omega^2}. \tag{3.51}$$

Introduce also for an arbitrarily fixed finite $D\in S$ and $\varepsilon_1>0$ an event

$$\mathcal{A}_n=\left\{\frac{\#\{x_i:x_i=y\}}{n}-\mu(y)\ge-\varepsilon_1\mu(y),\quad\text{for all}\quad 0\le y\le D\right\}\cap\mathcal{B}_n$$

with $\mathcal{B}_n$ defined by (3.16). Observe that by assumption (1.1) and by (3.17)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\mathcal{A}_n\right\}\to 1 \tag{3.52}$$

as $n\to\infty$. Let

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}(\cdot)=\mathbf{P}\left\{\cdot\mid\mathcal{A}_n\right\}$$

denote the conditional probability.

Given a graph $G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)$ we shall reveal recursively its connected components in the following way. Let V_1 be a random vertex uniformly distributed on $\{1,\dots,n\}$, and let $L_1 = \tau_n^{V_1}$ be the set of vertices in the tree with a root at vertex V_1 (see definition of the algorithm in Section 3.5.1).

For any $U \subset \{1,\dots,n\}$ let $\tau_n^{i,U}$ denote a set of vertices of the tree constructed in the same way as τ_n^i but on the set of vertices $\{1,\dots,n\}\setminus U$ instead of $\{1,\dots,n\}$. In particular, with this notation $\tau_n^{i,\emptyset} = \tau_n^i$.

Given constructed components $L_1,\dots,L_k$ for $1 \le k \le [N]$, let V_{k+1} be a vertex uniformly distributed on $\{1,\dots,n\}\setminus\cup_{i=1}^k L_i$, and set $L_{k+1} = \tau_n^{V_k,\cup_{i=1}^k L_i}(V_{k+1})$. If $\{1,\dots,n\}\setminus\cup_{i=1}^k L_i = \emptyset$, we simply set $L_{k+1} = \emptyset$. Then according to (3.52) we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) < \left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \delta\right)\log n\right\} \le \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{\max_{1\le i\le [N]+1} |L_i| < \omega\right\} + o(1) \tag{3.53}$$

as $n\to\infty$. Consider now

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{\max_{1\le i\le [N]+1} |L_i| < \omega\right\} \tag{3.54}$$
$$= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{|L_1| < \omega\right\}\prod_{i=1}^{[N]} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{|L_{i+1}| < \omega \mid |L_1| < \omega,\dots,|L_i| < \omega\right\}.$$

Similar to (3.19), let us also define

$$|\tau_n^U(x)| :=_d |\tau_n^{i,U}|\Big|_{x_i = x}$$

for each $x \in S$, $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ and $U \subset \{1,\dots,n\}$. Notice that if $U \subset U'$ then $|\tau_n^{U'}(x)|$ is stochastically dominated by $|\tau_n^U(x)|$ for any $x \in S$. This allows us to derive from (3.54) that

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{\max_{1\le i\le [N]+1} |L_i| < \omega\right\} \le \left(\sup_{x\in S}\ \max_{U\subset\{1,\dots,n\}:|U|\le N\omega} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{|\tau_n^U(x)| < \omega\right\}\right)^N. \tag{3.55}$$

To approximate the distribution of $|\tau_n^U(x)|$ we introduce another branching process which will be stochastically dominated by B_κ. First define for any value $D \in S$ a probability measure $\hat{\mu}_D$

$$\hat{\mu}_D(y) = \begin{cases} M_D^{-1}\mu(y), & \text{if } y \le D, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{3.56}$$

where $M_D := \sum_{y\le D}\mu(y)$ is a normalizing constant. Then for any positive c and D let $\hat{B}_{c,D}$ be a process defined similar to B_κ, but with the distribution of offspring

$$Po\left(c\kappa(x,y)\hat{\mu}_D(y)\right) \tag{3.57}$$

instead of $Po\left(\kappa(x,y)\mu(y)\right)$. Notice, that $\hat{B}_{1,\infty}$ is defined exactly as B_κ. Let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x)$ denote the total number of the particles (including the initial one) produced by the branching process $\hat{B}_{c,D}$ starting with a single particle of type x.

Lemma 3.3. *Let conditions of Theorem 1.3 be fulfilled. For all large D and all small ε_1 in definition of $\mathcal{A}_n$ one can find $c<1$, arbitrarily close to 1, so that*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{|\tau_n^U(x)|<\omega\right\} \le \left(1+b\frac{\log^4 n}{n^2}\right)^{n\omega}\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x)<\omega\right\}$$

for all large n and all $U\subset\{1,\dots,n\}$ with $|U|\le N\omega$, where b is some positive constant independent of x,c and D (ω and N are defined by (3.50) and (3.51)).

Proof. At each step of the exploration algorithm which defines $\tau_n^{i,U}$, the number of the type y offspring of a particle of type x has a binomial distribution $Bin(N'_y, p_{xy}(n))$ where N'_y is the number of remaining vertices of type y.

Here we shall explore another relation between the binomial and the Poisson distributions. Let $Y_{n,p}\in Bin(n,p)$ and $Z_\lambda\in Po(\lambda)$. Then it is straightforward to derive from the formulae for the corresponding probabilities that for all $0<p<1/4$ and $0\le k\le n$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\{Y_{n,p}=k\} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}p^k(1-p)^{n-k} &= \frac{n!}{n^k(n-k)!}\left((1-p)e^{\frac{p}{1-p}}\right)^n e^{-n\frac{p}{1-p}}\frac{\left(n\frac{p}{1-p}\right)^k}{k!}\\ &\le (1+\gamma p^2)^n\,\mathbf{P}\{Z_{n\frac{p}{1-p}}=k\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.58}$$

where γ is some positive constant (independent of n, k and p). Also notice, that (3.58) trivially holds for all $k>n$.

We shall find now a lower bound for N'_y. Conditionally on $\mathcal{A}_n$ we have

$$N_y := \#\{x_i : x_i = y\} \ge (1-\varepsilon_1)\mu(y)n \tag{3.59}$$

for all $y<D$. By deleting an arbitrary set U with $|U|\le N\omega$ from $\{1,\dots,n\}$, we may delete at most $N\omega$ vertices of type y. Hence, conditionally on $\mathcal{A}_n$ at any step of the exploration algorithm which defines $\tau_n^{i,U}$ with $|\tau_n^{i,U}|<\omega$, the number N'_y of the remaining vertices of type y, is bounded from below as follows

$$N'_y \ge N_y - \omega - N\omega,$$

and thus by (3.59)

$$N'_y \ge n(1-\varepsilon_1)\mu(y) - \omega - N\omega$$

for all $y < D$. Taking into account definitions (3.51) and (3.50) we derive from here that for any $\varepsilon' > 0$ one can choose small $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ so that

$$N'_y \geq (1-\varepsilon')\mu(y)n$$

for all $y \leq D$ and large n. This implies that conditionally on $\mathcal{A}_n$ at any step of the exploration algorithm we have

$$N'_y \frac{p_{xy}(n)}{1-p_{xy}(n)} \geq \mu(y)(1-\varepsilon')\kappa(x,y) \tag{3.60}$$

for any $y \leq D$ and large n. Now with a help of (3.56) we rewrite (3.60) as follows:

$$N'_y \frac{p_{xy}(n)}{1-p_{xy}(n)} \geq \hat{\mu}_D(y)M_D(1-\varepsilon')\kappa(x,y) =: \hat{\mu}_D(y)c\kappa(x,y) \tag{3.61}$$

for all $x, y \in S$, where

$$c = M_D(1-\varepsilon').$$

Recall that $\lim_{D\to\infty} M_D \uparrow 1$. Therefore choosing appropriately constants D and ε_1 we can make c arbitrarily close to 1.

Using now relation (3.58) between the Poisson and the binomial distributions, and taking into account (3.61), we derive for all k and $N'_y \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\{Y_{N'_y, p_{xy}(n)} = k\} &\leq (1+\gamma p^2_{xy}(n))^{N'_y}\ \mathbf{P}\{Z_{N'_y \frac{p_{xy}(n)}{1-p_{xy}(n)}} = k\} \\ &\leq \left(1+\gamma c_1^2 A_1^4 \frac{\log^4 n}{n^2}\right)^n \mathbf{P}\{Z_{N'_y \frac{p_{xy}(n)}{1-p_{xy}(n)}} = k\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.62}$$

where we used bound (3.24). Note that in the last formula $Z_{N'_y \frac{p_{xy}(n)}{1-p_{xy}(n)}}$ stochastically dominates $Z_{\hat{\mu}_D(y)c\kappa(x,y)}$ due to (3.61). This implies that if conditionally on $\mathcal{A}_n$, at each of at most ω steps of the exploration algorithm we replace the $Bin(N'_y, p_{xy}(n))$ variable with the

$$Po\left(\hat{\mu}_D(y)c\kappa(x,y)\right)$$

one, we arrive at the following bound using the branching process $\hat{B}_{c,D}$

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{A}_n}\left\{|\tau_n^U(x)| < \omega\right\} \leq \left(1+\gamma c_1^2 A_1^4 \frac{\log^4 n}{n^2}\right)^{n\omega} \mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) < \omega\right\} \tag{3.63}$$

for all large n. This yields the statement of Lemma 2.1. □

Combining now (3.53) with (3.55) and using Lemma 3.3, we derive

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big) < \omega\right\} \le \left(\left(1+b\frac{\log^4 n}{n^2}\right)^{n\omega} \sup_{x\in S} \mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) < \omega\right\}\right)^N + o(1)$$

$$\le e^{b_1 \log^3 n} \sup_{x\in S}\left(1-\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) \ge \omega\right\}\right)^{n/\omega^2} + o(1) \qquad (3.64)$$

as $n \to \infty$, where b_1 is some positive constant independent of c and D.

Assume from now on that

$$c = M_D.$$

Define an operator associated with branching process $\hat{B}_{c,D}$:

$$T_D[f](x) := T_{c\kappa,\hat{\mu}_D}[f](x) = \int_0^D \kappa(x,y)f(y)d\mu(y) = \sum_{y\le D} \kappa(x,y)f(y)\mu(y).$$

Clearly, under assumption $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$ we also have

$$\|T_D\| < 1. \qquad (3.65)$$

Hence, $T_{c\kappa,\hat{\mu}_D}$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.2 (*ii*), which together with Remark 2.1 implies that

$$\hat{r}(D) := \sup\{z \ge 1 : \mathbf{E} z^{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x)} < \infty\} > 1 \qquad (3.66)$$

for all $x \in S$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{X}(x)$ is stochastically larger than $\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x)$ for all $x \in S$. Therefore we have

$$r_\kappa \le \hat{r}(D) \qquad (3.67)$$

for all $D \in S$. Furthermore, we shall prove the following result.

Lemma 3.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.3*

$$\lim_{D\to\infty} \hat{r}(D) = r_\kappa.$$

Proof. Note that $\hat{r}(D)$ is non-increasing in D. Therefore inequality (3.67) implies existence of the limit

$$\lim_{D\to\infty} \hat{r}(D) \ge r_\kappa. \qquad (3.68)$$

We shall show that if

$$z < \hat{r}(D) \qquad \text{for all } D, \qquad (3.69)$$

then also

$$z < r_\kappa. \tag{3.70}$$

This together with (3.68) will immediately imply the statement of the lemma.

From now on we fix z which satisfies (3.69). Then for any $D \in S$ equation

$$f = ze^{T_D[f-1]} =: \Phi_{D,z}[f] \tag{3.71}$$

has a finite minimal solution f_D, which by (2.3) equals

$$f_D(x) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D,z}[1](x) < \infty \tag{3.72}$$

for all $x \in S$. To prove (3.70) it is sufficient to show that equation

$$f = ze^{T[f-1]} =: \Phi_z(f) \tag{3.73}$$

has a finite minimal solution as well. Therefore we shall prove that

$$f_\infty(x) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_z[1](x) < \infty \tag{3.74}$$

for all $x \in S$, which by Theorem 2.1 is the minimal solution to (3.73).

Claim. For all $k \geq 1$ and for all $x \in S$

$$\lim_{D\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D,z}[1](x) = \Phi^k_z[1](x). \tag{3.75}$$

(Notice that the existence of the limit follows simply by the monotonicity of $\Phi_{D,z}$.)

Proof of the Claim. We shall use the induction argument. First, we notice that for all $x \in S$

$$\Phi_{D,z}[1](x) = z = \Phi_z[1](x),$$

and

$$\Phi^2_{D,z}[1](x) = ze^{T_D[1](x)} \uparrow ze^{T[1](x)} = \Phi^2_z[1](x) < \infty, \tag{3.76}$$

as $D \to \infty$.

Assume now that (3.75) holds for some $k > 1$. We shall show that then also

$$\lim_{D\to\infty} \Phi^{k+1}_{D,z}[1](x) = \Phi^{k+1}_z[1](x), \tag{3.77}$$

for all $x \in S$, which together with (3.76) will imply (3.75) for all $k \geq 1$. Set

$$g_D := \Phi^k_{D,z}[1], \qquad g := \Phi^k_z[1].$$

By the assumption $g_D \uparrow g$ as $D \to \infty$. Then with a help of Theorem on Monotone Convergence we derive

$$\lim_{D\to\infty} \Phi^{k+1}_{D,z}[1] = \lim_{D\to\infty} \Phi_{D,z}[g_D] = \lim_{D\to\infty} ze^{T_D[g_D-1]} = ze^{T[g-1]} = \Phi^{k+1}_z[1],$$

which proves (3.77). $\square$

Using (3.75) we can rewrite function in (3.74) as

$$f_\infty(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \lim_{D\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D,z}[1](x). \tag{3.78}$$

Recall that by Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.1 we have either $f_\infty(x) < \infty$ or $f_\infty(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in S$ (take into account that S is countable here). Our aim is to prove that $f_\infty(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in S$.

Assume, that on the contrary, $f_\infty(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in S$. Let $x_0 = \min\{x \in S\}$ (recall that $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots\}$). By (3.78) for any $C > 0$ there is $k_0 = k_0(C) > 1$ such that

$$\lim_{D\to\infty} \Phi^{k_0}_{D,z}[1](x_0) > C, \tag{3.79}$$

which in turn implies that there is $D_0 = D_0(C)$ such that

$$\Phi^{k_0}_{D_0,z}[1](x_0) > C. \tag{3.80}$$

In the case of condition (C3) kernel κ is non-decreasing, and therefore (3.80) yields as well

$$\Phi^{k_0}_{D_0,z}[1](x) \geq \Phi^{k_0}_{D_0,z}[1](x_0) > C \tag{3.81}$$

for all $x \in S$.

In the case of condition (C1) (and (1.11)) there is a constant $0 < b \leq 1$ such that

$$\frac{\kappa(x,y)}{\kappa(x',y)} \geq b$$

for all $x, x', y \in S$. Then for any $D > 0$, $k > 1$ and for all $x \in S$

$$\Phi^k_{D,z}[1](x) = ze^{\sum_S \kappa(x,y)\left(\Phi^{k-1}_{D,z}[1](y)-1\right)\mu(y)} \geq ze^{b\sum_S \kappa(x_0,y)\left(\Phi^{k-1}_{D,z}[1](y)-1\right)\mu(y)} \geq \left(\Phi^k_{D,z}[1](x_0)\right)^b.$$

This together with (3.80) implies

$$\Phi^{k_0}_{D_0,z}[1](x) > C^b \tag{3.82}$$

for all $x \in S$.

Now due to the definition in (3.72), and (3.82) or (3.81) we have

$$f_{D_0}(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D_0,z}[1](x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D_0,z}[\Phi^{k_0}_{D_0,z}[1]](x) \geq \lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D_0,z}[C^b](x). \tag{3.83}$$

It is straightforward to derive taking into account condition (1.11) and the definition of $\Phi_{D,z}$, that for any $D > 0$, $z \geq 1$ and all large A one has

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{D,z}[A](x) = \infty.$$

Hence, choosing constant C large enough, we derive from (3.83) that

$$f_{D_0}(x) = \infty,$$

which contradicts inequality in (3.72). Hence, (3.74) holds, which finishes the proof of Lemma.

□

By Lemma 3.4 for any given $\delta_1 > 0$ we can find a large constant D such that

$$\hat{r}(D) < r_\kappa + \delta_1/2. \tag{3.84}$$

From the definition (3.66) of $\hat{r}(D)$ it follows that for any $\delta_1 > 0$ and $x \in S$ there is an unbounded increasing sequence $\{\omega_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ of positive numbers such that for $c = M_D$

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) > \omega_k\right\} \geq A(\hat{r}(D) + \delta_1/2)^{-\omega_k}$$

for some positive constant $A = A(\delta_1, x) < \infty$. Combining this with (3.84) we get

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) > \omega_k\right\} \geq A(\hat{r}(D) + \delta_1/2)^{-\omega_k} \geq A(r_\kappa + \delta_1)^{-\omega_k}. \tag{3.85}$$

Note that for any $\delta > 0$ and all large n there always exists at least one $\omega_{k(n)} \in \{\omega_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ such that

$$\omega = \left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \delta\right)\log n \leq \omega_{k(n)} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\log n.$$

Hence by (3.85) and the fact that $r_\kappa > 1$ we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) > \omega\right\} \geq \mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) > \omega_{k(n)}\right\} \geq A(r_\kappa + \delta_1)^{-\omega_{k(n)}} \tag{3.86}$$

$$\geq A(r_\kappa + \delta_1)^{-\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\log n}.$$

Recall that κ satisfies $(C3)$ or $(C1)$ of Theorem 1.2. If condition $(C3)$ is satisfied, then due to the monotonicity of $\kappa(x, y)$ a vertex of type $x_0 = \min S$ has among all different types $x \in S$ the smallest probabilities of the incident edges, which are $\kappa(x_0, y)/n$, $y \in S$. This together with (3.86) implies for all $x \in S$

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) > \omega\right\} \geq \mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x_0) > \omega\right\} \geq A_0(r_\kappa + \delta_1)^{-\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\log n}, \tag{3.87}$$

where $0 < A_0 = A(\delta_1, x_0) < \infty$.

Otherwise, when condition $(C1)$ is satisfied, $\kappa(x, y)$ is uniformly bounded from zero and infinity. Then there is a constant A_0 such that $A(\delta_1, x) > A_0 > 0$ for all $x \in S$, which together with (3.86) yields the same bound

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^{c,D}(x) > \omega\right\} \geq A_0(r_\kappa + \delta_1)^{-\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\log n}$$

for all $x \in S$ in this case as well.

Bound (3.87) allows us to derive from (3.64) that for any $\delta > 0$ and $\delta_1 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n, \kappa)\Big) < \omega\right\} \qquad (3.88) \\ &\leq e^{b_1 \log^3 n}\left(1 - A_0(r_\kappa + \delta_1)^{-\left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\log n}\right)^{\frac{n}{(\alpha \log n)^2}} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \delta$. Now for any $\delta > 0$ we choose a positive δ_1 so that

$$\gamma_1 := \left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\log\left(r_\kappa + \delta_1\right) < 1.$$

Then (3.88) becomes

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n, \kappa)\Big) < \left(\frac{1}{\log r_\kappa} - \delta\right)\log n\right\} \leq e^{b_1 \log^3 n}\left(1 - \frac{A_0}{n^{\gamma_1}}\right)^{\frac{n}{(\alpha \log n)^2}} + o(1), \tag{3.89}$$

where the right-hand side goes to zero when $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. □

3.5.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3.

Clearly, Theorems 3.2 and 3.1 yield the assertion of Theorem 1.3 when $\|T_\kappa\| < 1$.

When $\|T_\kappa\| \geq 1$ we have $r_\kappa = 1$ by Corollary 1.2. It is clear that for any $0 < c < 1/\|T_\kappa\| \leq 1$ the size $C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)$ stochastically dominates $C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,c\kappa)\Big)$. Then we have by the previous case for any $0 < c < 1/\|T_\kappa\| \leq 1$

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)}{\log n} < \frac{1}{2\log r_{c\kappa}}\right\} \leq \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,c\kappa)\Big)}{\log n} < \frac{1}{2\log r_{c\kappa}}\right\} \to 0 \tag{3.90}$$

as $n \to \infty$. By Lemma 3.1 we have $r_{c\kappa} \to 1$ as $c \uparrow 1/\|T_\kappa\|$. Therefore we derive from (3.90) that

$$\frac{C_1\Big(G^{\mathcal{V}}(n,\kappa)\Big)}{\log n} \xrightarrow{P} \infty = \frac{1}{\log r_\kappa},$$

which finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

Acknowledgment The author thanks P. Kurasov for the helpful discussions.

References

[1] B. Bollobás, Random graphs, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[2] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 31 (2007), 3-122.

[3] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, The phase transition in the uniformly grown random graph has infinite order. Random Structures Algorithms 26 (2005), no. 1-2, 1-36.

[4] P. Erdös and A. Rényi, On the evolution of random graphs. Publ. *Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* 5 (1960), 17–61.

[5] S. Janson, The largest component in a subcritical random graph with a power law degree distribution. *Annals of Applied Prob.* 4 (2008), 1651–1668

[6] C. J. Mode, Multitype branching processes. Theory and applications. Modern Analytic and Computational Methods in Science and Mathematics, 34 (1971).

[7] R. Otter, The multiplicative process. Ann. Math. Statistics 20 (1949), 206–224.

[8] T.S. Turova, Phase transitions in dynamical random graphs, Journal of Statistical Physics, 123 (2006), no. 5, 1007-1032.

[9] T.S. Turova, The size of the largest component below phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs, arXiv:0706.2106v1 [math.PR]

[10] T.S. Turova and T. Vallier, Merging percolation on Z^d and classical random graphs: Phase transition. (arXiv:math.PR/0612644)